

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,437	04/24/2001	V	George Leo Stegemeier	5659-08100/EBM	5260
759	90 11/05/2003		<b>~</b> .	EXAMINER	
DEL CHRISTENSEN			SUCHFIELD, GEORGE A		
SHELL OIL CC P.O. BOX 2463				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOUSTON, TX 77252-2463				3672	
				DATE MAILED: 11/05/200	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>
	Application No.	pplicant(s)	
Office Action Comments	09/841,437	STEGEMEIER TAL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George Suchfield	3672	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Priod for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute,  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23.5	Sentember 2003		
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		rosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under			
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> is/are pendir			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>531,533-537,539,541-556,558,560,56</u>	63-609,5396,5397,5400-5403 an	<u>d 5529-5616</u> is/are rejected.	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		- <b>-</b>	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 May 2003</u> is/are: a) ☐			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	_is: a)  approved b) disappro	oved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	·		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ammer.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n prionty under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	1)-(d) or (t).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority document			
2. Certified copies of the priority document			
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior</li> <li>application from the International Bu</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-	
14)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(	e) (to a provisional applicatior	າ).
a) The translation of the foreign language pro			
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 2 ( 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	4) Interview Summar Notice of Informal 6) Other:	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)	
S. Patent and Trademark Office			

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 531,533-537,539,541-556,558,560,563-609,5396,5397,5400-5403 and 5529-5616.

Application/Control Number: 09/841,437

Art Unit: 3672

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Page 2

2. Claim 5532 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5529 requires the heating rate to be "less than about 1oC per day", while claim 5532, which depends from this claim, calls for a heating rate of "about 10oC/day". Claim 55 is both indefinite and comprises an improper dependent claim in calling for a heating rate outside the range of their parent claim. In this regard, a dependent claim must include all the features of the parent claim, and then specify an additional limitation.

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 531, 533-537, 539, 541-556, 558, 560, 563-609, 5396, 5397, 5400-5403 and 5529-5616 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over copending applications (including the present application):

Art Unit: 3672

```
09/840,936; 09/840,937; 09/841,000; 09/841,060; 09/841,061; 09/841,127; 09/841,128; 09/841,129; 09/841,130; 09/841,131; 09/841,170; 09/841,193; 09/841,194; 09/841,195; 09/841,238; 09/841,239; 09/841,240; 09/841,283; 09/841,284; 09/841,285; 09/841,286; 09/841,287; 09/841,288; 09/841,289; 09/841,290; 09/841,291; 09/841,292; 09/841,293; 09/841,294; 09/841,295; 09/841,296; 09/841,297; 09/841,298; 09/841,299; 09/841,300; 09/841,301; 09/841,302; 09/841,303; 09/841,304; 09/841,305; 09/841,306; 09/841,307; 09/841,308; 09/841,309; 09/841,311; 09/841,312; 09/841,429; 09/841,430; 09/841,431; 09/841,432; 09/841,433; 09/841,434; 09/841,435; 09/841,436; 09/841,437; 09/841,438; 09/841,439; 09/841,440; 09/841,441; 09/841,442; 09/841,443; 09/841,444; 09/841,445; 09/841,446; 09/841,447; 09/841,448; 09/841,449; 09/841,488; 09/841,496; 09/841,490; 09/841,491; 09/841,492; 09/841,493; 09/841,494; 09/841,495; 09/841,496; 09/841,497; 09/841,498; 09/841,499; 09/841,501; 09/841,501; 09/841,502; 09/841,632; 09/841,633; 09/841,634; 09/841,635; 09/841,636; 09/841,637; 09/841,638; and 09/841,639.
```

Claims 531, 533-537, 539, 541-556, 558, 560, 563-609, 5396, 5397, 5400-5403 and 5529-5616 are specifically provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 531-556 and 558-609 of copending Application No. 09/841,430. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the hydrocarbon-containing formation treated by the method of claim 531 and 570 of this pending application is deemed broad enough to encompass or comprise the coal formation of claim 531 and 570 of the copending application. Otherwise, the remaining claims of both this and the copending application appear to correspond, with the additional limitation in claims 5396 and 5397 to 20 heat sources per recovery well deemed an obvious matter of choice or design based on, e.g., the characteristics, properties and/or areal extent of particular hydrocarbon formation encountered in the field.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 3672

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Suchfield whose telephone number is 703-308-2152. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30 - 3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bagnell can be reached on 703-308-2151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Serge Suchfield George Suchfield Primary Examiner Art Unit 3672

Gs November 4, 2003